



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

26  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,568	05/02/2001	Frederik M. DeWolf	T7900-10	6323
35465	7590	08/24/2005	EXAMINER	
GREGORY CHARLES FLICKINGER 223 PHEASANT RUN SE ROME, GA 30161				PATEL, JAGDISH
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3624		

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/740,568	DEWOLF ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JAGDISH PATEL	3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) 55-61 is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-9,13,14,17-19,21,22,24,25,27-29,31-33,35,37,38,42,43,46-48,50-54 and 64-84 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-5,7-9,13,14,17-19,21,22,24,25,27-29,31-33,35,37,38,42,43,46-48 and 50-61 and 64-84.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to amendment filed 4/6/05.

***Response to Amendment***

2. Per request claims 2-3, 14, 18, 24, 28-29, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 42-43 46-48, 52 and 55-56 have been amended, and new dependent claims 64-84 have been added. Claims 6, 10-12, 15-16, 20-21, 23, 26, 30, 34, 36, 39-41, 44-45, 49, and 62-63 have been cancelled. Therefore, currently claims 1-5, 7-9, 13-14, 17-19, 21, 22, 24-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 42-43, 46-48, 50-63 are currently pending and subject of examination.

***Filing Date Correction***

The examiner will consult appropriate authority for correction of the filing date requested.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Previously cited rejection of claims under 35 USC 101, 35 USC 112(second) and 35 USC 103(a) have been withdrawn.

This office action is a non-final action due to rejection under 35 USC 101 and 35 USC 112 (second) not previously addressed.

***Claim Objections***

Claim 83 is dependent upon claim 86, which does not exist. It is assumed to be dependent upon claim 52.

**35 USC 101 Rejection**

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 13-14, 17-19, 21, 22, 24-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 42-43, 46-48, 50, 51, 64-70 and 76-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

Method claims 1-5, 7-9, 13-14, 17-19, 21, 22, 24-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 42-43, 46-48, 50 are not within technological arts.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the “progress of science and the useful arts” (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim to pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts. The phrase “technological arts” has been created and used by the courts to offer another

view of the term "useful arts". See *In re Musgrave*, 167 USPQ (BNA) 280 (CCPA 1970). Moreover, the courts have found that a claimed computer implemented process was within the "technological art" because the claimed invention was an operation being performed by a computer within a computer. See *In re Toma*, 197 USPQ (BNA) 852 (CCPA 1978). Finally, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) has recently affirmed a §101 rejection finding the claimed invention to be non-statutory based on a lack of technology. See *Ex parte Bowman*, 61 USPQ2d (BNA) 1669 (BdPatApp&Int 2001).

In the present application, the method claims have no connection to the technological arts. None of the steps indicate any connection to a computer or technology. The step of identifying, assigning, recording, categorizing, managing (read, write privileges) and providing access to the attributes could be performed manually by a person or an organization by manual process or procedures. The term "network" as recited on some claims (e.g. claim 22) could also include communication over the US Postal network and other courier services. Therefore, the claims are directed towards non-statutory subject matter. To overcome this rejection the Examiner recommends that Applicant amend the claims to better clarify which of the steps are being performed within the technological arts, such as incorporating a computer communication network or electronic communication network into the communicating steps. One suggestion is to clearly recite that the asset registry is an electronic asset registry and that the process of recording, categorizing, managing and providing access is performed using one or more computerized devices. Please also note that the amended must be fully supported by the specification.

Please note that mere recitation of the technological art in the preamble (i.e., intended or field of use) or mere implication of employing a machine or article of manufacture to perform some or all of the recited steps does not confer statutory subject matter to an otherwise abstract

idea unless there is positive recitation in the claim as a whole to breathe life and meaning into the preamble.

8. Claims 52, 79-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non statutory subject matter.

35 U.S.C. §101 requires that in order to be patentable the invention must be a “new and useful process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter or new and useful improvement thereof” (emphasis added). Claim 52 is intended to embrace or overlap two different statutory classes of invention as set forth in 35 U.S.C. §101. (see rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for specific details regarding this issue). “A claim of this type is precluded by express language of 35 U.S.C. §101 which is drafted so as to set forth statutory the statutory classes of invention in the alternative only”, *Ex parte Lyell* (17USPQ2d 1548).

9. Claims 71-75 and 84 are rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed inventions are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 71-75 and 84 are directed to disembodied data structure which are *per se* are not statutory (*In re Warmerdam*, No. 93-1294 (Fed. Cir. August 11, 1994)).

Note that functional descriptive material consists of data structure and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. Nonfunctional descriptive material includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.

In the present case, the claimed data structure is mere arrangement of data without any associated functionality. Quoting MPEP section 2106. IV. B. 1.

“When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material stored in a computer-readable medium does not make it statutory. Such a result would exalt form over substance. *In re Sarkar*, 588 F.2d 1330, 1333, 200 USPQ 132, 137 (CCPA 1978) (“[E]ach invention must be evaluated as claimed; yet semantogenic considerations preclude a determination based solely on words appearing in the claims. In the final analysis under 101, the claimed invention, as a whole, must be evaluated for what it is.”) (quoted with approval in *Abele*, 684 F.2d at 907, 214 USPQ at 687). See also *In re Johnson*, 589 F.2d 1070, 1077, 200 USPQ 199, 206 (CCPA 1978) (“form of the claim is often an exercise in drafting”). Thus, nonstatutory music is not a computer component and it does not become statutory by merely recording it on a compact disk.”

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 52 and 79-83 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 52 (and the dependent claims) are not sufficiently precise due to the combining of two different statutory classes of invention in a single claim. The preamble the claim refers to a system, but the body of the claim recites process steps (e.g. categorizing, managing) in combination with elements of the system (e.g. an asset registry and a network).

12. Claims 52, 79-83 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 52, 79, 81, 83 recites phrase “the plurality of entities” which lacks positive antecedent basis.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

13. Claims 55-61 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAGDISH PATEL whose telephone number is (571) 272-6748. The examiner can normally be reached on 800AM-600PM M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (571) 272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 517-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Jagdish N. Patel

(Primary Examiner, AU 3624)

8/22/05